IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA WESTERN DIVISION No. 5:18-HC-2137-D

MICHAEL J. JEFFERSON,)
Petitioner,)
)
v.) ORDER
SHAWNTELLIA JENKINS, et al.,	j)
Respondents) .)

On April 12, 2019, Magistrate Judge Numbers issued a Memorandum and Recommendation ("M&R") and recommended that the court dismiss Michael J. Jefferson's ("Jefferson" or "petitioner") 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition for failure to state a claim [D.E. 5]. On April 22, 2019, Jefferson objected to the M&R [D.E. 6, 7].

"The Federal Magistrates Act requires a district court to make a de novo determination of those portions of the magistrate judge's report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." <u>Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.</u>, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (emphasis, alteration, and quotation omitted); <u>see</u> 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). Absent a timely objection, "a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." <u>Diamond</u>, 416 F.3d at 315 (quotation omitted). Moreover, the court need not conduct de novo review if a party makes "general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate's proposed findings and recommendations." <u>Orpiano v. Johnson</u>, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982); see United States v. Midgette, 478 F.3d 616, 621 (4th Cir. 2007).

Jefferson's objections do not meaningfully address the M&R. Because there is no clear error

on the face of the record, the court accepts the recommendations in the M&R.

SO ORDERED. This __t_ day of May 2019.

Alternatively, the court overrules Jefferson's objections. Jefferson's challenge to a state child support order is not cognizable under section 2254. See Jones v. Cunningham, 371 U.S. 236, 237–40 (1963); Wilson v. Flaherty, 689 F.3d 332, 339 (4th Cir. 2012); Sevier v. Turner, 742 F.2d 262, 268–69 (6th Cir. 1984); Mitchell v. Chapman, No. 3:10CV577, 2011 WL 577018, at *2 (W.D.N.C. Feb. 8, 2011) (unpublished).

In sum, the court ADOPTS the conclusions in the M&R [D.E. 5], OVERRULES Jefferson's objections [D.E. 6, 7], and DISMISSES Jefferson's petition for failure to state a claim. The court DENIES a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c); Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336–38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 483–84 (2000). The clerk shall close the case.

JAMES C. DEVER III
United States District Judge